## God NC

#### First, God exist, two warrants.

#### It’s the only logical causal explanation for existence of the universe – any other explanation fails.

Craig [William Lane Craig, Debate between WLC and Christopher Hitchens at Biola U, 2009, http://hitchensdebates.blogspot.com/2010/07/hitchens-vs-craig-biola-university.html]

This conclusion has been confirmed by remarkable discoveries in astronomy and astrophysics. In one of the most startling developments of modern science **we** now **have** pretty **strong evidence that the universe is not eternal** in the past **but had an absolute beginning** about thirteen billion years ago in a cataclysmic event known as the Big Bang. What makes **the Big Bang** so startling is that it **represents the origin of the universe from** literally **nothing**, for all matter and energy, even physical space and time themselves, came into being at the Big Bang. As the physicist P. C. W. Davies explains, "The coming into being of the universe, as discussed in modern science, is not just a matter of imposing some sort of organization upon a previous incoherent state but literally the coming into being of all physical things from nothing." Now, this puts the atheist in a very awkward position. As Anthony Kenny of Oxford University urges, "A proponent of the Big Bang theory, at least if he is an atheist, must believe that the universe came from nothing and by nothing." But surely that doesn't make sense. **Out of nothing, nothing comes**. So why does the universe exist, instead of just nothing, where did it come from? There must have been a cause which brought the universe into being. Now **as the cause of space and time, this being must be an uncaused, timeless, spaceless, immaterial being** of unfathomable power. Moreover, it must be personal as well. Why? Because the cause must be beyond space and time, therefore **it cannot be physical or material**. Now there are **only two** kinds of **things** that **fit that description**: either **an abstract object**, like numbers, **or** else a personal mind. But **abstract objects can't cause anything**. **Therefore** it follows **that the cause of the universe is a transcendent, intelligent mind**.

#### The modal ontological argument—the GCB’s existence in a possible world implies necessary existence in our world.

Himma (Kenneth Einar Himma, Seattle Pacific University, “Anselm: Ontological Argument for God's Existence,” IEP, <http://www.iep.utm.edu/ont-arg/#H4>)

Perhaps the most influential of contemporary modal arguments is Plantinga's version. Plantinga begins by defining two properties, the property of maximal greatness and the property of maximal excellence, as follows: A being is maximally excellent in a world W if and only if it is omnipotent, omniscient, and morally perfect in W; and A being is maximally great in a world W if and only if it is maximally excellent in every possible world. Thus, maximal greatness entails existence in every possible world: since a being that is maximally great at W is omnipotent at every possible world and non-existent beings can't be omnipotent, it follows that a maximally great being exists in every logically possible world. Accordingly, the trick is to show that a maximally great being exists in some world W because it immediately follows from this claim that such a being exists in every world, including our own. But notice that the claim that a maximally great being exists in some world is logically equivalent to the claim that the concept of a maximally great being is not self-contradictory; for the only things that don't exist in any possible world are things that are conceptually defined in terms of contradictory properties. There is no logically possible world in which a square circle exists (given the relevant concepts) because the property of being square is inconsistent with the property of being circular. Since, on Plantinga's view, the concept of a maximally great being is consistent and hence possibly instantiated, it follows that such a being, i.e., God, exists in every possible world. Here is a schematic representation of the argument:

#### Godel’s theorem of model logic proves God’s existence.

Knight 13 [David Knight, Computer Scientists ‘Prove’ God Exists, 2013, Spiegel Online, http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/bild-928668-541456.html]

When Gödel died in 1978, he left behind a tantalizing theory based on principles of modal logic -- that a higher being must exist. The details of the mathematics involved in Gödel's ontological proof are complicated, but in essence the Austrian was arguing that, by definition, God is that for which no greater can be conceived. And while God exists in the understanding of the concept, we could conceive of him as greater if he existed in reality. Therefore, he must exist. Even at the time, the argument was not exactly a new one. For centuries, many have tried to use this kind of abstract reasoning to prove the possibility or necessity of the existence of God. But the mathematical model composed by Gödel[’s] proposed a proof of the idea. Its theorems and axioms -- assumptions which cannot be proven -- can be expressed as mathematical equations. And that means they can be proven. Proving God's Existence with a MacBook That is where Christoph Benzmüller of Berlin's Free University and his colleague, Bruno Woltzenlogel of the Technical University in Vienna, come in. Using an ordinary MacBook computer, they have shown that Gödel's proof was correct -- at least on a mathematical level -- by way of higher modal logic. Their initial submission on the arXiv.org research article server is called "Formalization, Mechanization and Automation of Gödel's Proof of God's Existence."

#### Second, prefer a Christian interpretation of God. These are also independent warrants for God’s existenceL

#### Historical evidence supports the resurrection, which makes Christianity the most plausible explanation of the creator.

Craig 2 [Craig, William Lane. “Is There Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus.” Worcester, Mass: College of the Holy Cross; 28 March, 2006. http://www.philvaz.com/apologetics/p96.htm#Moderator. Debate Between William Craig and Bart Ehrman. Prof. of philo @ Talbot School of Theology]

Paul tells us that **Jesus appeared** to his chief disciple **Peter**, then to the inner circle of disciples known as **the Twelve**; then he appeared to a group of **500 disciples** at once, then to **his** younger **brother James**, who up to that time was apparently not a believer, then to all the apostles. Finally, **[and] Paul** adds, "he appeared also to me," at the time when Paul was still **a persecutor** of the early Jesus movement(1 Cor 15:5-8). **Given** the early date of Paul's information as well as **his personal acquaintance** with the people involved, **these** appearances **cannot be** dismissed as **mere legends**. 2. The appearance **narratives** in the Gospels **provide multiple, independent attestation of the appearances**. For example, **the appearance** **to Peter** is attested **by Luke and Paul**; the appearance **to the Twelve** is attested **by Luke, John, and Paul**; **and** the appearance **to the women** is attested **by** **Matthew and John**. The **appearance narratives span** such **a breadth of independent sources that** it **cannot be** reasonably **denied** that the earliest disciples did have such experiences. Thus, even the skeptical German New Testament critic Gerd Lüdemann concludes, "It may be taken as historically certain that Peter and the disciples had experiences after Jesus' death in which Jesus appeared to them as the risen Christ." [4]

#### The Resurrection is the only logical explanation for the empty tomb

**Lynn et al** [John Lynn et al, "Beyond A Reasonable Doubt: 23 Arguments for the Historical Validity of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ," Spirit & Truth Fellowship International]

No reputable New Testament historian doubts the historical fact that the tomb in which Christ was placed after his crucifixion was empty Therefore, there are only three explanations for it. Either his enemies took the body, his friends took the body, or Jesus was raised from the dead. The first possibility is extremely unlikely, because his enemies would have certainly displayed his body if they could have, in order to humiliate his disciples, quell the rumors of his resurrection, as well as to cut short any new religious movement that threatened their Mosaic traditions. It is equally unlikely that his friends would have taken his body, because after his crucifixion they were profoundly disappointed and discouraged men who did not believe that he would be resurrected. It is absurd to think that under these conditions they would invent a scheme in which they [his friends] would steal away the body to fabricate a story they obviously did not believe.

#### The Eucharistic Miracle of Lanciano has scientifically proven the Eucharist is the physical body of Christ- all other explanations fail.

**Zenit News 05** [Zenit News, "Physician Tells of Eucharistic Miracle of Lanciano," Zenit News, May 5, 2005]

The phenomenon dates back to the eighth century. **A Basilian monk**, who had doubts about the real presence of Christ in the sacred species, **was offering Mass**, in a church dedicated to St. Legontian **in** the town of **Lanciano**. When he pronounced the words of the consecration, **the host was miraculously changed into physical flesh and the wine into** physical **blood**. Later **the blood** coagulated **and** the **flesh** remained the same. These relics **were kept** **in the cathedral**. **Linoli**, a **professor of anatomy** and pathological histology, and of chemistry and clinical microscopy, and former head of the Laboratory of Pathological Anatomy at the Hospital of Arezzo, is the only doctor who has analyzed the relics of the miracle of Lanciano. His findings have stirred interest in the scientific world. At the initiative of Archbishop Pacifico Perantoni of Lanciano, and of the provincial minister of the Franciscan Conventuals of Abruzzo, and with authorization from Rome, in November 1970 the Franciscans of Lanciano decided to have the relics examined scientifically. Linoli was entrusted with the study. He was assisted by Dr. Ruggero Bertelli, retired professor of human anatomy at the University of Siena. Linoli **extracted** parts of the relics with great care **and** then **analyzed the remains** of "miraculous flesh and blood." He presented his findings on March 4, 1971. **His study confirmed** that the flesh and blood were of human origin. **The flesh was** unequivocally **cardiac tissue**, and the blood was of type AB. Consulted by ZENIT, Linoli explained that "as regards the flesh, I had in my hand the endocardium. Therefore, there is no doubt at all that it is cardiac tissue." In regard to the blood, the scientist emphasized that "**the blood group is the same as** that of the man of **the** holy **Shroud of Turin**, **and** it is particular because it has the **characteristic**s **of a man** who was **born** and lived **in the Middle East** regions." "The AB blood group of the inhabitants of the area in fact has a percentage that extends from 0.5% to 1%, while in Palestine and the regions of the Middle East it is 14-15%," Linoli said. **Linoli's analysis revealed no** traces of **preservatives** in the elements, **meaning** that **the blood could not have been extracted from a corpse,** because **it would have been rapidly altered**. Linoli's report was published in "Quaderni Sclavo di Diagnostica Clinica e di Laboratori" in 1971. In 1973, the Higher Council of **the World Health Organization** (WHO) appointed a scientific commission to verify the Italian doctor's conclusions. The work was carried out over 15 months with a total of 500 examinations. The conclusions of all the researches **confirmed** **what had been** stated and **published** in Italy.

#### Our existence is contingent on God, so reciprocity creates an obligation

Mortimer [Robert C. Mortimer, Former Anglican Bishop of Exeter. Excerpt from his book Christian Ethics, 1950. <http://spot.colorado.edu/~heathwoo/readings/mortimer.html>]

The Christian religion has a clear revelation of the nature of God, and by means of it instructs and enlightens the consciences of men. The first foundation is the doctrine of God the Creator. God made us and all the world. Because of that He has an absolute claim on our obedience. **We** do not **exist** in our own right, but **only as** His **[God’s] creatures**, who ought therefore to do and be what He [God] desires. We do not possess anything in the world, absolutely, not even our own bodies; **we hold things in trust** for God, who created them, **and are bound**, therefore, to **use them** only **as [God]** He **intends** that they should be used. This is the doctrine contained in the first chapters of Genesis. God created man and placed him in the Garden of Eden with all the animals and the fruits of the earth at his disposal, subject to God's own law. "Of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shall not eat." Man's ownership and use of the material world is not absolute, but subject to the law of God. From the doctrine of God as the Creator and source of all that is, it follows that a thing is not right simply because we think it is, still less because it seems to be expedient. It is right because God commands it. This means that there is a real distinction between **right and wrong** which **is** **independent of what** **we** happen to **think**. It is **rooted in the** nature and **will of God**.

#### Prefer additionally: 1. Risk of God outweighs framework defense.

Kreeft [Kreeft, Peter (Professor of philosophy at Boston College). Handbook of Christian Apologetics. 1994]

But **the only** chance of **infinite justice is if God exists and we believe, while the only** chance of doing **infinite injustice is if God exists and we do not believe**. If God does not exist, there is no one there to do infinite justice or infinite injustice to.

#### 2. educational settings should uniquely focus on desecularization.

**Ardura 99** [Paul Poupard and Bernard Ardura, "Towards a Pastoral Approach to Culture," PONTIFICAL COUNCIL FOR CULTURE, 23 May 1999, http://www.vatican.va/roman\_curia/pontifical\_councils/cultr/documents/rc\_pc\_pc-cultr\_doc\_03061999\_pastoral\_en.html#top]

But when families are beset by so many different problems, they cannot be expected to cope alone. Hence the greater importance of educational institutions. In many countries, the Church carries out her mission as an educator and teacher by running nurseries or kindergartens, schools, colleges, high schools, universities and research centres. These Catholic institutions have the specific vocation of bringing Gospel values to the heart of culture. In order to do this, those who are pastorally responsible for these institutions must draw the substance of their educational projects from Christ's message and from the teaching of the Church. However, to implement their mission, such institutions depend largely on means that are often scarce. One must accept the facts of the matter in order to grasp the challenge: the Church is obliged to dedicate a considerable part of its human and financial resources to education so as to respond to the mission it received from Christ, to proclaim the Gospel. In all cases, one need remains: that of associating a concern for deep human and Christian formation with that of providing serious academic formation.(23) For the multitude of young people who attend educational institutions throughout the world can frequently, despite the efforts and the competence of teachers, be fully educated but partially deculturated.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the teachings of the church.

#### God negates- Lying and blasphemy are intrinsically evil- they are acts that are an orientation away from God.

**Conte 10** [on [Ron Conte, 10 year long member of Catholic Forums, Intrinsically Evil Acts, http://forums.catholic.com/showthread.php?t=476417]

"Reason attests that **there are** objects **of the human act which are by their nature 'incapable of being ordered' to God, because they radically contradict the good of the person made in his image.** **These are** the acts which, in the Church's moral tradition, have been termed **'intrinsically evil' (intrinsece malum): they are such always and per se, in other words, on account of their very object, and quite apart from the ulterior intentions** of the one acting and the circumstances." (Veritatis Splendor, n. 80). "In teaching the existence of intrinsically evil acts, the Church accepts the teaching of Sacred Scripture. The Apostle Paul emphatically states: 'Do not be deceived: neither the immoral, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor sexual perverts, nor thieves, nor the greedy, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor robbers will inherit the Kingdom of God' (1 Cor 6:9-10)." (Veritatis Splendor, n. 81). "If acts are intrinsically evil, a good intention or particular circumstances can diminish their evil, but they cannot remove it. **They remain 'irremediably' evil acts; per se and in themselves they are not capable of being ordered to God and to the good of the person**…. Consequently, circumstances or intentions can never transform an act intrinsically evil by virtue of its object into an act 'subjectively' good or defensible as a choice." (Veritatis Splendor, n. 81). **Examples of intrinsically evil acts**: murder direct abortion contraception euthanasia theft **lying** fornication adultery **blasphemy**

#### Pope Francis proves that limitations on constitutionally protected expression are good.

**Topping 15** Alexandra Topping, 1-16-2015, "Pope Francis: freedom of expression has limits," Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jan/15/pope-francis-limits-to-freedom-of-expression

Pope Francis has said there are limits to freedom of expression and that following the [Charlie Hebdo attack](https://www.theguardian.com/world/charlie-hebdo-attack) in Paris “one cannot make fun of faith”. On a plane from Sri Lanka to the [Philippines](https://www.theguardian.com/world/philippines), the largest Catholic majority country in Asia, the pope said freedom of speech was a fundamental human right but “every religion has its dignity”. Asked about the attack that killed 12 people at the offices of Charlie Hebdo – targeted because it had printed depictions of the prophet Muhammad – he said: “One cannot provoke, one cannot insult other people’s faith, one cannot make fun of faith. “There is a limit. Every religion has its dignity … in freedom of expression there are limits.” He gestured to Alberto Gasparri, who organises papal trips and was standing by his side, and added: “If my good friend Dr Gasparri says a curse word against my mother, he can expect a punch. It’s normal. It’s normal. You cannot provoke. You cannot insult the faith of others. You cannot make fun of the faith of others.”

# Frontlines

## AT: Secular Theory

#### Counter-Interpretation: Debaters can read religiously-affiliated frameworks

#### The net benefit is racial inclusion.

#### First, their attempt to exclude religious arguments from the debate space constitutes an implicit exclusion of people of color from the philosophical sphere. Even if the interp might allow for religious arguments on the condition that the judge, the audience, and the opponent says that they are okay with religious arguments, the mere fact that they mandate I ask is bad because someone has the opportunity to say no and potentially exclude people of color from philosophical discussion, Sullivan[[1]](#footnote-1):

The shift from de jure to de facto white domination and privilege in the United States has meant that whiteness increasingly operates in hidden, covert ways. In the days of lynching and Jim Crow, for example, whiteness used to stomp around in big-booted strides of oppression. Nowadays it tends to tiptoe, but its soft pattering can be deceptive. 1 The fact that white privilege and domination are more difficult to detect does not mean that they have disappeared. Today white privilege often functions unconsciously and “invisibly” (at least to most white people) and is all the more effective and difficult to eliminate because of its hidden modes of operation. 2 Within the academic discipline of contemporary philosophy, **whiteness** also **tends to function** in unseen ways. As I will argue in this chapter, one of those ways is **through contemporary philosophy’s secularity.** **Given that religion and spirituality often are important components of the lives of people of color, a philosophy that is hostile to religion tends to produce a chilly climate** for them. That chilly climate **helps ensure the ongoing whiteness of philosophy by implicitly discouraging people of color to enter and remain in the academic discipline of philosophy.** This process is especially effective because it functions without explicit mention of the topic of race.Whether the discipline is friendly or hostile to religion would seem to have nothing to do with the whiteness of philosophy, and this this seeming lack of connection makes the whiteness of philosophy all the more powerful because it enables philosophy’s whiteness to perpetuate itself in hidden , invisible ways.

#### Second, religion is key to the lives of people of color, Sullivan[[2]](#footnote-2) 2:

Cornel West has argued that “**the culture of the wretched of the earth is deeply religious,” and since many of those wretched worldwide are people of color**, this means that **the culture of many people of color is religious.** Continuing his point, West urges “**to be in solidarity** with them **requires not only an acknowledgement of what they are up against** **but also an appreciation of how they cope with their situation,” which includes appreciation of the place of religion in** their **lives**. 23 I will discuss the positive role **of** religion in West’s prophetic pragmatism shortly. But first, let me turn to other **African American and Hispanic/ Latino** scholars who attest to the importance of religion to the lives of **people of color.**

To clarify, i’m not saying that all people of color are religious, but rather that religion is a broad pattern of meaning and experience in their lives, **Sullivan 3**:

**My claim is not that all African Americans or** Hispanics/ **Latinos are religious nor that wretchedness sums up either group’s lived experience.** And **I recognize that some philosophers of color explicitly reject religion** because they are concerned, for example, about “the morally questionable record of religion” and the fact that religion seems “always [to be] on the side of those who [are] in power.” 24 **Avoiding stereotypes of African Americans and** Hispanics/ **Latinos should not mean**, however, **ignoring broad patterns of meaning and experience in their lives. One of those crucial patterns is** that **religion** tends to play an important role in the lives of many Hispanics/ Latinos and African Americans.

The impact is the perpetuating of whiteness which entails total exclusion to people of color from the philosophical sphere. Sullivan 4[[3]](#footnote-3)

Given the importance of religion to the lives of many people of color, the effect of philosophy’s silence on the subject is similar to that which Charles Mills has called the silence of exclusion**.** 44 Mills explains how **the silence about race and racism in most of mainstream Western philosophy implicitly excludes people of color from participating in the field. The message sent by this exclusion is that the lives of people of color do not matter enough even to be acknowledged in philosophical discourse.** Likewise, **philosophy’s silence about religion** is not neutral. It **sends a message that religion has no positive role to play in sophisticated, up-to-date philosophical discussion.** This message, in turn, sends another: that the concerns of people of color are not the concerns of philosophy. **Excluding religious concerns from philosophy has racialized effects for the discipline**, in other words, indirectly but **effectively saying to people of color that they have no place in philosophy**— at least, not as people of color. Generally speaking, only if people of color have been willing to check their race at the door when they enter the whitewashed halls of philosophy could they enter at all. **The result** was and **is the demographic and conceptual whiteness of philosophy.** 46 **Philosophy in the northern and western hemispheres tends to be populated by white people who then take up their concerns as if they were universal, without acknowledging or even seeing their false universalization.** Without mentioning the word “race” at all, the very framework of philosophy as exclusive of religion can estrange people of color from the discipline. 47 No wonder then that philosophy often does not appeal to students of color, who then would never consider continuing their graduate studies in philosophy so they could enter the profession. The failure of philosophy to appreciate religious life as a meaningful form of lived experience is not the only reason that people of color sometimes avoid the field, but it is an important one.

## AT: Fem

#### TURN: The cross undermines the foundational principles that legitimize patriarchy. GORMAN:

Michael J Groman [the Raymond E. Brown Professor of Biblical Studies and Theology at St. Mary's Seminary & University in Baltimore, Maryland, USA, where he has taught since 1991] . Cruciformity: Paul's Narrative Spirituality of the Cross. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub., 2001. Print

“By redefining the meaning of power, **the cross** of Paul’s gospel **undermines the very power structures that make the abuse of the cross possible.** Feminist theologian Sally Purvis argues that the cross “can only be used to harm and suppress with certain shared assumptions about power,” but “[p]roperly understood, the ‘power of the cross’ subverts its own nature as harmful and oppressive.” **Patriarchal power**, whether first-century Roman or twenty-first-century American, **is built on certain** foundational **principles about the male self and its relation to God** and others**. The cross causes those foundations to crumble by displaying a naked, powerless man as the power of God.** In the cross, **power** has become life-giving love; it **is** the power **to be weak**, the power to serve, **the power not to be in power.**  The cross undermines other forms of power, too, and these are not all patriarchal. The abuse of power is not limited to males on the basis of their maleness. Elitism, love of status, and the pursuit of power over others manifest themselves in all communities, even those in which women are in control. If it is possible for the oppressed to become the oppressor, it is possible even for oppressed females to become female oppressors. The cross of Paul’s gospel allows for none of this kind of power; it does not require that the power be patriarchal before it can undergo critique. What the gospel does require, no matter what form the power takes, is for power to be conformed to the cross. In every instance, this means that power structures must first be destabilized and deconstructed under the shadow of the cross, so that they may be rebuilt on new foundations that are appropriate to the gospel and that are life-giving to the communities that embody them.”

## AT: Homophobia

Acceptance is now possible and is becoming easier each day. **TELMUSA:**

“Black Churches are Becoming more Gay-Friendly.” Blue **Telusma**. The Grio. September 11 2014. <http://thegrio.com/2014/09/11/black-churches-gays/> For years, there has been an unspoken but deeply prevalent “don’t ask, don’t” tell policy in the black church. But today, Duke University released data that show those days may be coming to an end. Their research has found:

“**Acceptance of homosexual[s]** members **in black** protestant **churches has surged** of late**.** **The percentage** of churchesaccepting of gay and lesbian members **has risen from 44 percent in** 20**06 to 62** percent **in** 2**012.** Further, **22 percent** of black churches **report**ed **being accepting of gays in** volunteer **leadership** roles, **up from 6.5** percent six years **prior**.”This isn’t the first time we’ve seen a spike in gay acceptance in the church. Just last year, Pope Francis made international news when he called on the Catholic Church to love gays and lesbians, who “must be accepted with respect, compassion and sensitivity.” Many applauded Francis for being so inclusive, but black congregations have historically been a lot more resistant to such progressive ideals — especially where homosexuality is concerned. Which begs the question: why have African-American churchgoers suddenly become so gay friendly? Filmmaker Yoruba Richen speculates: “What’s happening within the black church — and in the black community as a whole — is reflective of what’s happening in the country as a whole in terms of an opening to talking about sexuality and to supporting same-sex marriage. Barack Obama came out for same-sex marriage, which I think affected a lot of people’s willingness to be open to the idea. The NAACP came out after Barack Obama. **Many black churches and leaders** **of black churches started to come out and support marriage equality**, many of whom have a national presence.” Richen may be on to something, because Duke’s data came from the National Congregations Study, which in 2012 interviewed the leaders of 1,331 American churches, mosques, temples, synagogues and other houses of worship. 2012 is also the year President Obama “came out” in support of same sex marriage. Is that a coincidence? Perhaps not. Either way, **these findings confirm** what many LGBT Christians have started noticing around the country; **generations of anti-gay prejudices within the black church are being dismantled.**”

**Non Unique-** Strong ideology is inevitable and leads to evil. Religion isn’t the problem. **KELLER:**

Timothy J. Keller [Pastor at Redeemer Church in NYC. Keller is considered to be a leading figure of the evangelical intelligentsia movement and Marshall’s favorite pastor to listen to podcasts from] The Reason for God: Belief in an Age of Skepticism. New York: Dutton, 2008. Print.

“*Hitchens’s point is fair. Religion “transcendentalizes” ordinary cultural differences so that parties feel they are in a cosmic battle between good and evil. This is why Hitchens argues that “religion poisons everything.” So it would seem.* **Christian nations institutionalized imperialism***, violence, and oppression through the Inquisition and the African slave trade.* **The totalitarian** *and militaristic* **Japanese empire** *of the mid-twentieth century* **grew out of** *a culture deeply influenced by Buddhism and* **Shintoism.** *Islam is the soil for much of today’s terrorism, while Israeli forces have often been ruthless too. Hindu nationalists, in the name of their religion, carry out bloody strikes on both Christian churches and Muslim mosques. All of this evidence seems to indicate that religion aggravates human differences until they boil over into war, violence, and the oppression of minorities.4 There are problems with this view,* **however***.* **The Communist Russian, Chinese, and Cambodian regimes** *of the twentieth century* **rejected** *all* **organized religion** *and belief in God. A forerunner of all these was the French Revolution, which rejected traditional religion for human reason.* **These societies were** *all rational and* **secular, yet each produced massive violence** *against its own people without the influence of religion***.** *Why? Alister McGrath points out that* **when** *the idea of* **God is gone, a society will “transcendentalize” something else***, some other concept, in order to appear morally and spiritually superior. The Marxists made the State into such an absolute, while the Nazis did it to race and blood.* **Even** *the ideals of* **liberty and equality can** *be used**in this way in order to* **do violence** *to opponents. In 1793, when Madame Roland went to the guillotine on trumped-up charges, she bowed to the statue personifying liberty in the Place de la Révolution and said, “Liberty, what crimes are committed in your name.” 5 Violence done in the name of Christianity is a terrible reality and must be both addressed and redressed. There is no excusing it. In the twentieth century, however, violence has been inspired as much by secularism as by moral absolutism. Societies that have rid themselves of all religion have been just as oppressive as those steeped in it. We can only conclude that there is some violent impulse so deeply rooted in the human heart that it expresses itself regardless of what the beliefs of a particular society might be—whether socialist or capitalist, whether religious or irreligious, whether individualistic or hierarchical. Ultimately, then,* **the fact of violence** *and warfare in a society* **is no necessary refutation** *of the prevailing beliefs of that society.”*

**7.** You are misreading history by cherry picking scenarios. Almost all of the greatest goods have been done in the name of religion. **KELLER 2:**

Timothy J. Keller [Pastor at Redeemer Church in NYC. Keller is considered to be a leading figure of the evangelical intelligentsia movement and Marshall’s favorite pastor to listen to podcasts from] The Reason for God: Belief in an Age of Skepticism. New York: Dutton, 2008. Print.

“**Christians****began** *to work for* **abolition****not because of** *some* **general** *understanding of* **human rights, but** *because they saw it as violating* **the will of God.** *Older forms of indentured servanthood and the bond-service of Biblical times had often been harsh, but Christian abolitionists concluded that race-based, life-long chattel slavery, established through kidnapping, could not be squared with Biblical teaching either in the Old Testament or the New.13 Christian* **activists such as** *William* **Wilberforce** *in Great Britain, John Woolman in America, and many, many others* **devoted their entire lives, in the name of Christ, to end**ing **slavery.** *The slave trade was so tremendously lucrative that there was enormous incentive within the church to justify it. Many church leaders defended the institution.* The battle *for self-correction* was titanic.*14 When the abolitionists finally had British society poised to abolish slavery in their empire, planters in the colonies foretold that emancipation would cost investors enormous sums and the prices of commodities would skyrocket catastrophically. This did not deter the Abolitionists in the House of Commons. They agreed to compensate the planters for all freed slaves, an astounding sum up to half of the British government’s annual budget. The Act of Emancipation passed in 1833, and* the costs *were* so high *to the British people that* one historian called *the* British abolition *of slavery* “voluntary econocide.” *Rodney Stark notes how historians have been desperately trying to figure out why the abolitionists were willing to sacrifice so much to end slavery. He quotes the historian Howard Temperley, who says that the history of abolition is puzzling because most historians believe all political behavior is self-interested. Yet despite the fact that hundreds of scholars over the last fifty years have looked for ways to explain it, Temperley says, “***no one** *has succeeded in showing that those* **who campaigned** *for the end of the slave trade…***stood to gain** *in any tangible way…or that these measures were other than economically costly to the country.”* **Slavery was abolished** because it was wrong, and **Christians** *were the* **lead***ers* **in saying so.***15 Christianity’s self-correcting apparatus, its critique of religiously supported acts of injustice, had asserted itself. Another* *classic case* *of this is* **[also] the Civil Rights movement** *in the United States in the mid-twentieth century. In an important history of the movement, David L. Chappell demonstrates that it* **was not** *a* **political but** *primarily a* **religious** *and spiritual movement*. White *Northern* liberals *who were the allies of the African-American civil rights leaders* were not proponents of civil disobedience *or of a direct attack on segregation*. *Because of their secular belief in the goodness of human nature,* they thought *that* education *and enlightenment* would bring *about* inevitable *social and racial* progress. *Chappell argues that* **black leaders were** *much more* **rooted in** *the* **Biblical understanding** *of the sinfulness of the human heart and in the denunciations of injustice that they read in the Hebrew prophets*. *Chappell also shows how it was* **the vibrant faith** of rank-and-file African-Americans *that* **empowered them to insist on justice despite** *the* **violent opposition** *to their demands. Thus Chappell says there is no way to understand what happened until you see the Civil Rights movement as a religious revival*.*16 When* M*artin* L*uther* K*ing, Jr., confronted racism in the white church in the South, he did not call on Southern churches to become more secular. Read his sermons and “Letter from Birmingham Jail” and see how he argued. He* invokedGod’s *moral* lawand *the* Scripture. *He called white Christians to be more true to their own beliefs and to realize what the Bible really teaches. He did not say “Truth is relative and everyone is free to determine what is right or wrong for them.” If everything is relative, there would have been no incentive for white people in the South to give up their power. Rather, Dr. King invoked the prophet Amos, who said, “Let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream” (Amos 5:24). The greatest champion of justice in our era knew* the antidote *to racism* was not less *Christianity,* but *a deeper and* truer Christianity. *Wilberforce and King were not by any means the only leaders who have turned the tide against injustice in the name of Christ.* **[also] After apartheid** *was abolished* **in South Africa,****everyone expected a bloodbath** *in which former victims would take violent vengeance on their persecutors and former oppressors would defend themselves with force. Instead,* **Christian leaders like Desmond Tutu set up** *the remarkable South African Commission for* **Truth and Reconciliation** *in the mid-1990s. Its name expressed its principle and mission. It invited victims to come forward to tell their stories publicly. It also invited former perpetrators of oppression and violence to come forward, tell the truth, and ask for amnesty. No side was exempt from appearing before the commission. The commission heard reports of human rights violations and considered amnesty applications from all sides, from the former apartheid state as well as from the African National Congress. Though not without its flaws and critics, the commission helped bring about the transition of majority rule with far less bloodshed than anyone could have expected. In the late twentieth century the Catholic church in eastern Europe refused to die under Communism. Through “patience, candles, and crosses” it began the chain of events that brought down all those totalitarian regimes.* The Polish priest *Jerzy* Popieluszko*, through his preaching and activism,* led the movement for *a* free trade union in Communist Poland *in the early 1980s.* When *he was* murdered by the secret police, 250,000 people came to his funeral*, including Lech Walesa, whose Solidarity movement would help bring down the Communist government. Many of those who went to his funeral marched past the secret police headquarters with a banner that read “We Forgive.”17* The Christian underpinnings of the resistance *movement* were unmistakable.**There is a long list of martyrs who stood up for the oppressed in Jesus’s name,** such as Archbishop Oscar Romero of El Salvador. *Romero was made archbishop for his conservative, orthodox, doctrinal views. In his new post he saw irrefutable evidence of chronic and violent human rights abuses by the government. He began to speak out fearlessly against it, and as a result he was shot to death in 1980 while saying Mass. The famous Lutheran martyr Dietrich Bonhoeffer was pastoring two German-speaking churches in London when Hitler came to power. He refused to stay at a safe distance and returned to his country to head an illegal seminary for the Confessing Church, the Christian congregations that refused to sign an oath of allegiance to the Nazis. Bonhoeffer wrote the classic The Cost of Discipleship, in which he critiqued the religion and church of his day. In echoes of Jesus and the prophets, Bonhoeffer revealed the spiritual deadness and self-satisfied complacency that made it possible for so many to cooperate with Hitler and turn a blind eye to those being systematically marginalized and destroyed by the Nazis. Bonhoeffer was eventually arrested and hanged. In his last letters from prison, Bonhoeffer reveals how his Christian faith gave him the resources to give up everything for the sake of others. Marx argued that if you believe in a life after this one you won’t be concerned about making this world a better place. You can also argue the opposite.* If this world is all there is*,* and *if* the goods *of this world are the* onlylove, comfort, and wealth *I will ever have,* why *should I* sacrifice them for others? *Bonhoeffer, however, had a joy and hope in God that made it possible for him to do what he did: It is not a religious act that makes the Christian, but participation in the sufferings of God in the secular life. That is metanoia [repentance]: not in the first place thinking about one’s own needs, problems, sins, and fears, but allowing oneself to be caught up into the way of Jesus Christ…. Pain is a holy angel…. Through him men have become greater than through all the joys of the world…. The pain of longing, which often can be felt physically, must be there, and we shall not and need not talk it away. But it needs to be overcome every time, and thus there is an even holier angel than the one of pain, that is the one of joy in God.18 Why mention all of these examples? They are evidence that Dr. King was right.* **When people have done injustice in the name of Christ they are not** *being* **true****to the** *spirit of the* **one who** *himself* **died** *as* **a victim of injustice****and** *who* **called for** the **forgiveness** of *his* enemies. *When people give their lives to liberate others as Jesus did, they are realizing the true Christianity that Martin Luther King, Jr., Dietrich Bonhoeffer, and other Christian voices have called for.*”
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